

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

With this response, clarifying amendments are made to claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 7, 12, 15, 16, and 24. Claims 3, 14, and 17 are cancelled without prejudice.

The Examiner objected to the abstract because of use of the word “means.” With this amendment, a replacement abstract is submitted, removing the word “means” from the abstract.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-11 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being directed towards non-statutory subject matter because the claims did not recite a physical part of the device. Claim 1 has been amended to recite the physical aspects of the device. Support for the amendments is found in Figures 1 and 2 and the respective portions of the description, as originally filed. The Examiner further rejected claim 24 as being directed towards non-statutory subject matter because it recites a computer readable medium, which the Examiner contends includes signals according to the description. Claim 24 has been amended to recite a computer program product having a computer readable medium tangibly embodying computer executable code stored thereon. It is submitted that this amendment excludes the possibility that the claim includes a signal or transmission medium because signals and transmission media cannot have code stored on them. It is submitted that amended claims 1 and 24 are in compliance with 35 U.S.C. § 101.

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 2, 8-13, and 18-24 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,049,796 to Siitonen et al. (“Siitonen”). The Examiner further rejected claims 3-7 and 14-17 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Siitonen in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,950,988 to Hawkins et al. (“Hawkins”). While the Applicant does not agree with the Examiner’s anticipation rejections over Siitonen, the claims have been amended to advance the prosecution of this case. Claim 1 has been amended to include the subject matter of claim 3. Similarly, claim 12 has been amended to include the subject matter of claim 14. Applicant submits that the amended claims are not anticipated by Siitonen. The Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner’s obviousness rejections for the reasons that follow.

Claim 1 now recites a wireless communications device configured for use in a wireless network. The device comprises a processor for controlling operation of the wireless communications device; a first input device coupled to the processor for accepting an input; at least one display device coupled to the processor for communicating an output; a communications subsystem coupled to the processor for communicating with the wireless network; a memory coupled to the processor; a storage device coupled to the processor; and a user interface for controlling the operations of the wireless communications device. The user interface includes a component to compose a destination for an outgoing communication generated by the device. The component provides simultaneously together a prompt defining a field for receiving the destination as text; and a hot list of candidate destinations selectable at the user interface and usable as the destination. The user interface comprises a home screen component from which to invoke a feature from among a plurality of features provided by the device. The component to compose a destination is invokable from the home screen component automatically in response to an input of a portion of the destination.

At page 8 of the Office Action of April 4, 2008, the Examiner admits that Siitonen fails to teach or suggest that the user interface comprises a home screen component from which to invoke a feature from among a plurality of features provided by the device and wherein the component to compose a destination is invokable from the home screen component automatically in response to an input of a portion of the destination. The Examiner attempts to cure the deficiencies of Siitonen with reference to Hawkins. The Examiner points to Figure 5 and column 9, lines 42-47 of Hawkins, with regards to the claimed home screen component, and to Figure 6B and column 19, lines 42-48, with regards to the claimed component to compose a destination being invokable from the home screen component automatically in response to input of a portion of the destination. In contrast, the cited portion of Hawkins describes the screen shown in FIG. 5 as a contacts view. Further, it is plainly visible from comparing FIG. 5 and FIG. 6B of Hawkins that the two diagrams illustrate the same screen, which are both labelled “contacts.” Therefore, it is submitted that Hawkins fails to teach or suggest a home

screen component where composition of a destination is invocable from the home screen component automatically in response to input of a portion of the destination, as presently claimed.

In view of the above, it is submitted that the claimed subject matter includes features that are neither taught nor suggested by Siitonen and/or Hawkins, whether taken alone or in combination, and that claim 1 is not obvious in view of Siitonen and/or Hawkins. Independent claims 12 and 24 recite similar features and are patentable over Siitonen and/or Hawkins for the same reasons. Dependent claims 2-11 and 13-23 depend, either directly or indirectly, from claims 1 or 12 and are patentable for the same reasons.

Favourable reconsideration and allowance of the application are respectfully requested. Should the Examiner have any questions in connection with the Applicant's submissions, please contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

OGILVY RENAULT LLP

Date: July 3, 2008

By /mve/
Michael Van Eesbeek
Registration No. 61,951
Telephone (416) 216-4020
Fax (216) 216-3930

OGILVY RENAULT LLP
Suite 3800, Royal Bank Plaza, South Tower
200 Bay Street, P.O. Box 84
Toronto, Ontario M5J 2Z4
Canada